

Michael A. de Kraker
Georgia State University 404-651-2390
Internet:REGMAD@GSUSGI2.GSU.EDU
BITNET :REGMAD@GSUVM1 PACKET:KD4FKW@W400

To iterate is human, to recurse devine

Date: Thu, 13 May 93 19:28:25 CDT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!
unkaphaed!amanda!robert@ames.arpa
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Isn't it funny how this has degenerated to a code versus no-code debate?
I mean, come on now, folks. We now have a no-code license (Codeless
Technician), and those who can't or won't learn to code now have a door
in which to enter the hobby. So, it seems to me to be a moot point.

--Robert WA3J

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 09:06:09 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
: Isn't it funny how this has degenerated to a code versus no-code debate?
: I mean, come on now, folks. We now have a no-code license (Codeless
: Technician), and those who can't or won't learn to code now have a door
: in which to enter the hobby. So, it seems to me to be a moot point.
:
: --Robert WA3J

Actually Robert the point isn't moot. There are some on the net who would
like to see the code requirements lowered for the higher class licenses.
And there are those who would like to see the requirements changed in the
opposite way. as far as I know the discussion is not whether or not we
have a codeless license but rather should we change our license system.

Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *

And to complete the picture: License fees in Germany at the moment are 36 Deutschmarks (22 \$) per annum (paid on a monthly basis) which is supposed to increase dramatically. Currently, the DARC (German equivalent of ARRL) is fighting for an annual fee 'not higher than 120 Deutschmarks' (73 \$).

73, Wolf.
DL3ZBJ, AB6EL, VK6BGV.

Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 19:26:49 GMT
From: pipex!sunic!news.lth.se!news.lu.se!buster.hik.se!hik.se!fm91hn@uunet.uu.net
Subject: OPINION POLL!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Net citizens!

This is a desperate try to save our last course in university.
We are writing a study about the Net, how it all started, about the people living in it, however trying to explain the basics of how it all works.
That includes you, reader of this message.
We would be more than grateful if we could get your answers to the following questions;

1. For how many years have you known that Internet existed?
2. How often do you use the Net? (occasions per month)
3. Whatfor? (hobby, in your profession, socially...)
4. How do you access the Net? (university, profession, friends, private...)
5. Has the Net taken over roles that other media played before? (telephone, newspapers, TV, girlfriend...)
6. What newsgroups/type of information do you take part of?
7. Male or Female?
8. Age?

If you have the time;

9. What's your future visions about the Net? Limits and/or possibilities.
10. How do you think/hope law and censorship will change over time ahead?

We also want to apologize for taking up so much bandwidth with this.
This request has been spread to 60 newsgroups, chosen at random, but, you know how it is, term end is closing up, panic spreads.
Email address: fm91hn@hik.se or fm91pb@hik.se

Sincere Respect And May The Force Be With You All!

Peter & Henrik

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 05:16:03 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!caen!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!newsserver.sfu.ca!
sfu.ca!tpang@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Reciprocal in US and Hong Kong for Canadian?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I am getting my Canadian Certificate with Advanced Qualification and I don't have the morse endorsement yet (which is not needed). I want to know what class of operating privileges in US do I get? I was told I don't need to get a reciprocal license, which is extended automatically.

What about Hong Kong? Someone said you need the morse endorsement before they issue the reciprocal license there. I think that doesn't seem right, or is it?

When I identify my callsign (10 more days I'll have it :) in US, what do I say for the end part? Is it:

VE7xxx/W6 ? Do I actually say "forward-stroke" ?? :), I read them on books, but I don't know how to pronounce them? Could it be N6 or K6 too? Why W6?

Any info is appreciated, e-mail will be nice, but I'll also check this group, as it might be a faq. (Laura, in my area, has just posted about the same thing about UK ones, one guy sent out from UK said she needs a form to be filled out, and should be available from a national club: so is it CRRL? I hope she got the answer).

Thanks again,

Regards,
David

| In real life: David Tse E-mail: tpang@sfu.ca (Internet) |
| Snail Mail: P.O. Box 26052, Richmond, B.C., V6Y 1Z3, Canada |
| Home: Amiga A3000/25/100/6 + AMaxII + ZyXEL U-1496E + HP DeskJet PLUS |

Date: Fri, 14 May 93 14:59:03 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
atlas.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <93132.133819WKOEHLE@ESOC.BITNET> WOLF KOEHLER <WKOEHLE@ESOC.BITNET> writes:

>In article <1993May12.021920.107854@locus.com>, dana@spica.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) says:

>>Once upon a time ...(stuff deleted) ... if you were in the communications
>>business, you needed to know how send and receive CW with the available
>>equipment at the time, which was the human hand and ear (and maybe a
>>semi-auto key). If you didn't know CW, you were limited from a
>>lot of business.

>

>True for business, but again you're missing the point. I maintain the
>opinion that amateur radio is a pastime, not a business, wouldn't you agree?
>An I know the difference as I was in the business side of it.

Yes, amateur radio, by definition, is not a business. However, that has nothing to do with my analogy, which was discussing the relative importance of CW to communications *in general*. I contend, and Part 97 (the US law governing amateur radio) that amateur radio is *not* a museum of ancient radio arts, that amateur radio is supposed to be providing advancement of the state of the radio art. I am not for the outlawing of code; in my analogy, I make reference to the people that still shoe horses for fun, recognizing that part of the hobby. Of course, you've deleted that part of the analogy, since it blows apart your argument that "I'm missing the point".

I believe the meaning of the analogy is clear. There's probably no value in engaging in a petty argument based on a minor semantic disagreement.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 08:44:34 GMT

From: agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@ames.arpa

Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

WKOEHLE@ESOC.BITNET (WOLF KOEHLER) writes:

You obviously agree that CW is antiquated, why then is it a valid means to determine what privileges an Amateur should be awarded. "Because them's the rules" won't work as you concede that changing the rules is a valid avenue below. There must be another reason YOU feel CW exams are a valid licensing requirement for further privs. Please let us know what it is.

: obsolete.

I too favor that method but I'll wait until I get married, thank you. I also don't want to see it become obsolete, that is one activity that the FCC doesn't have to require a certain skill level to interest people in the "mode" If CW is also fun why do you think the FCC must require an exam? If it is so much fun people will use it without a license requirement. I think that many of the people who favor lifting or changing the cw requirements have more faith in the mode than you seem to.

: So take one advice, old chum: Overcome your frustration, give yourself a new objective and learn CW. Learn it thoroughly, then you'll like it. And it's not the speed that counts, believe me.

Who the hell said I haven't learned CW? Who the hell said I was frustrated? The desire to change doesn't automatically indicate an inability to cope.

: Life c a n be fun, and so can CW. :
Life IS fun! I'm sure CW is for some but why REQUIRE it?

: Wolf. : DL3ZBJ, AB6EL, VK6BGV.
Does Germany have a no-code license?

aws
Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* I do not speak for the University of California.... *
* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 15:07:36 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <93132.133819WKOEHLE@ESOC.BITNET>,
<1993May13.082440.20340@ke4zv.uucp>, <93133.145245WKOEHLE@ESOC.BITNET>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?

In article <93133.145245WKOEHLE@ESOC.BITNET> WOLF KOEHLER <WKOEHLE@ESOC.BITNET> writes:

>In article <1993May13.082440.20340@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman)

>says:

>>

>>It's true that many amateurs view the *service* as a passtime, like
>>watching TV. And that's sad....

>

> Sad it is indeed, Gary, for watching TV (in most cases) is
> n o t a pastime, but more a w a s t e of time.

>

>>Note that I hope that the amateur radio service is a bit more useful
>>than watching TV in it's service to the public and humanity via it's
>>self training and innovation in electronics as well as the more direct
>>public service aspects. Still, if some see it only as a way to idle away
>>the empty hours in front of a box tapping a key, there's no reason to
>>impose their peculiar requirements on everyone else.

>

> Oh, you're absolutely right, Gary, with the first part of your
> statement. I can do nothing but stress it.

>

> What seems a bit strange to me is your picture of a ham radio
> operator as one sitting in front of a box tapping a key. That's
> not me as a radio amateur, that's none of my ham friends.
> (Well, sometimes it i s me but then I'm in my office.)

Well it's not my picture of the average amateur operator either, just
of the dyed in the wool Morse forever fanatic. There's *room* in the
service for such people, just as there's room for ATVers, packeteers,
and (God help us) phone DXers, but I don't think they should be the
centerpiece of what amateur radio is about. And their bent certainly
shouldn't dominate licensing exams as it does today.

> What you describe is either a computer freak or someone playing
> silly games on a computer. Being a computer freak may be helpful
> but doesn't qualify you as a radio amateur. My picture of a ham
> is a different one. And using ham radio only as a means to connect
> two machines to each other is also not my understanding of our
> hobby.

Substitute manual Morse fanatic for computer freak in the above and
begin to see why I think manual Morse is overemphasized on amateur
exams. Amateur radio is many things to many different people. Mostly
it's a playground of the mind for exploring different aspects of
radio technology and the transference of intelligence from one place

to another without wires.

> There are, thanks God, so many aspects in ham radio to make almost
> everyone happy if we are all tolerant enough to accept a few simple
> facts of life: Live and let live.

Indeed, live and let live is an excellent attitude toward the multitudinous interests contained in amateur radio, but let's not forget fairness, tolerance, and *relevance* when setting examination standards. One mode should not dominate the exam process. Whites only is an abhorrent holdover from earlier times, and so is Morse only in examinations of encoding proficiency.

Gary

--

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------|--|--------------------------|
| Gary Coffman KE4ZV | | You make it, | | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary |
| Destructive Testing Systems | | we break it. | | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary |
| 534 Shannon Way | | Guaranteed! | | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary |
| Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | | | |

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 13:43:47 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <93132.133819WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>, <C6xALy.1MJ@ucdavis.edu>,
<93133.135221WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?

In article <93133.135221WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET> WOLF KOEHLER <WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET> writes:

>In article <C6xALy.1MJ@ucdavis.edu>, ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. >Todd) says:

>>

>>I'll buy that, but in what way does that refute the arguement that CW is an >>antiquated mode....

>> (stuff deleted)

>>I don't use the old fashioned rythm nethod of birth control either, and >>that is certainly a hobby. Well *I* don't do it professionally anyway.

>

>Antiquated or not, that is not the point because you don't h a v e to >learn code to become a radio amateur and you don't h a v e to use CW >when you are one. With a no-code license you can still operate your station, >locally or world wide. The only drawback is that you are restricted to >certain modes and certain frequency bands. If you want higher privileges, >i. e. more bands available to you, you can overcome these restrictions

>by showing proof of higher knowledge, in our case learning code, in steps
>leading you to ever higher license classes until you have full privileges.

"higher knowledge"??? :-)

>Sometimes I wonder what some of you think life is all about. More and more
>people seem to take everything for granted nowadays. Ever heard of having
>to work for or to learn something? Rules may be changed, but there have
>to be rules nevertheless. Life without rules is anarchy. Do you want anarchy?

No one is asking for no rules, only that the rules be **relevant** to modern communications. Morse is not half of amateur radio, but it is currently half of all but one of the exams. No matter how much you get right on the rest of the elements, missing the Morse exam by just one letter, or question, too many means you don't upgrade. I don't think there'd be any complaint if the Morse questions were lumped in with the others. Then theoretically you could pass even if you missed all ten Morse questions, if you got enough of the other material correct. Certainly you can pass now if you miss all the ATV questions, and ATV is just as valid an operating mode as Morse. It's becoming nearly as popular too.

The complaint, and a valid one I think, is that manual Morse receives too much emphasis on the exam. I'd also contend that requiring high speed manual Morse proficiency in order to obtain additional **voice** mode privileges is an idiotic concept that obviously has no one to one mapping of relevance.

>So take one advice, old chum: Overcome your frustration, give yourself
>a new objective and learn CW. Learn it thoroughly, then you'll like it.
>And it's not the speed that counts, believe me.

For those of us who **did** learn manual Morse encoding back when there were no options, and learn it at a relatively brisk speed at that, it can still be a painfully awkward and slow method of communication. It's by no means certain that everyone will **like** Morse, no matter what test they're required to pass.

Gary

--

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------|--|--------------------------|
| Gary Coffman KE4ZV | | You make it, | | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary |
| Destructive Testing Systems | | we break it. | | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary |
| 534 Shannon Way | | Guaranteed! | | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary |
| Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | | | |

Date: 14 May 93 20:45:17 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!nucsr1!
ahab.eecs.nwu.edu!hpa@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C6Gu9B.K9L@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>, <2290@indep1.UUCP>,
<1993May12.093439.1@violet.ccit.arizona.edu>h
Reply-To : hpa@nwu.edu (H. Peter Anvin)
Subject : Re: sick of it all

In article <1993May12.093439.1@violet.ccit.arizona.edu> of
rec.radio.amateur.policy,
lester@violet.ccit.arizona.edu writes:

>
> Cliff, either I didn't get YOUR joke(?) or you (and others) didn't get mine.
> My "proposed exam" was entirely tongue-in-cheek, aimed at those who would
> propose to banish, or at least greatly reduce, the CW requirement from
> amateur exams.
>

I believe so was his.

/hpa

--

INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu FINGER: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu
BITNET: HPA@NUACC IBM MAIL: 36073 at IBMX400
HAM RADIO: N9ITP, SM4TKN NeXTMAIL: hpa@speedy.acns.nwu.edu
"Kissing a smoker is like licking an ashtray." -- R. Heinlein

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #144
